

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-17, and 19-34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Fairbanks* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,020). Applicant traverses the rejections for the reasons set forth below. Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the remarks below.

Claims 5, 6, 11, 19, 20, and 25 have been amended substantially back to their original dependent forms such that each claim depends either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 or 16. As such, support for the amendments can be found in the original claims 5, 6, 11, 19, 20, and 25. Independent claims 1, 16, and 31 remain as previously presented. Claims 35-49 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-17 and 19-34 are now pending in this application.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Independent claim 1 pertains to a method for performing design rule checking on an electronic design. The method requires among other things that "the extracting information operation is done only once for each node in the netlist." Independent claims 16 and 31 also contain similar limitations but in an apparatus format and a computer program product format respectively.

In contrast, *Fairbanks* fails to teach or suggest the extraction operation in the manner claimed. *Fairbanks* merely discloses various types of extractions (e.g., netlist extraction or simulated simulator netlist (SNF) extraction) associated with checking a logic design for compliance with a set of design rules. In particular, with reference to the Examiner's citations (i.e., SNF; col. 4, ll. 7-11; col. 7, ll. 42-45; col. 19, ll. 58-67; and col. 17, ll. 7-10) as noted on page 4 of the Office Action, *Fairbanks* does not disclose how the extractions are performed.

For example, SNF (simulator netlist extraction) as well as netlist extraction were noted simply to indicate which compilation stages the invention could be run in. (See col. 4, ll. 5-7: "During compilation, the invention runs in three places: after netlist extraction, after logic synthesis, and after simulated simulator netlist (SNF) extraction.") The citation col. 4, ll. 7-11 merely discloses where the rules are executed ("For example, illegal clock structures are detected after netlist extraction, while static hazards are detected in both the pre- and post-synthesis netlists after logic synthesis has executed."). The citation col. 7, ll. 42-45 merely discloses isolating groups of synchronous devices which share the same clock logic. (See col. 7, ll. 18-21) The citation col. 19, ll. 58-67 merely discloses information associated with a node and how the

node may relate to other nodes (e.g., "The structure lists the logical operation that it represents, the number of other nodes that are inputs to this node, and the number of fixed database records that are also inputs to this node."). (See also col. 19, ll. 49-55) The citation col. 17, ll. 7-10 merely discloses accessing a record (i.e., "look up the record for this macrofunction") for all nodes in the hierarchy tree.

As such, the citations merely disclose various types of extractions and access to the extracted information. The citations fail to disclose how the actual extraction is done. In particular, *Fairbanks* fails to teach or suggest that "the extracting information operation is done only once for each node in the netlist." In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 16, and 31 are patentably distinct from the cited art.

The Examiner's rejections of the dependent claims are respectfully traversed. Claims 2, 3, 5-15, 17, 19-30, and 32-34 each depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 16, or 31 and, therefore, are respectfully submitted to be patentable over cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 16, or 31. Further, the dependent claims require additional elements that when considered in context of the claimed inventions further patentably distinguish the invention from the cited art.

SUMMARY

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct such fees from the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. ALTRP085).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Desmund Gean
Reg. No. 52,937

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
Telephone: (510) 663-1100
Facsimile: (510) 663-0920

Application No. 10/601,015
ALTRP085/A880

Page 9 of 9